



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PROHIBITION IN PRACTICE.

THE lull in temperance enthusiasm, caused by the disgust resulting from political prohibition, will not be wholly disadvantageous, if the opportunity be improved to scrutinize anew the soundness of accepted principles, to reform lines of action, to discover and fortify positions that all will defend, to withdraw from indefensible points, to utilize weapons in our armory. The danger to temperance to-day is from the Prohibition Party. The advocates of temperance should everywhere insist upon what Dr. Porter and Judge Davis insisted so strenuously before election, and which was so strenuously denied—that Mr. St. John and the Prohibition Convention do not represent the great prohibition cause. The reason for prohibition stands now exactly where it has always stood, and it will be a sad thing if the folly of a few foolish women and a few bad men should blind us to the fact that the wise women and the honorable men who compose the great army of prohibitionists were as stanch to the other principles of Republicanism as they are to temperance, and fought against the prostitution of prohibition to the Democratic Party as loyally as was ever fought the battle of human rights in any other form.

There needs no sense, no system, no concerted action to do mischief. To do good often requires all three. Skill and study, the wealth and the toil of years, go to the rearing of a stately edifice, which barbarous hands, with a little dynamite wrapped in a ragged shawl, may destroy in a moment. For those whose only aim is destruction, there is no occasion to study principles or to take note of tendencies ; but those who desire the elevation of character, should watch progress and observe carefully the result of experiment, for their own guidance in further action. All who are in earnest, making fight, not for their own prominence or emolument chiefly, not for love of fighting, but to remove temptation and to build up

national temperance, cannot fail to discern that there are a great many of their number who believe that an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors, would be utterly futile if it were accomplished, is purely visionary and impracticable, and is moreover too antagonistic to the spirit of the Constitution to be even seriously attempted. While, therefore, this is a proper subject of argument and discussion, one would say that it was not a proper dividing line, because it would divide the advocates of temperance. What we want is a line sharply drawn between those who wish society to be self-governing and temperate, and those who wish it to be the slave of low vice and intemperance—massing and marshaling all the forces of the one against all the temptations of the other.

If a prohibitory Constitutional amendment be insisted on as the issue, the cause of intemperance will gladly accept it, and the victory of temperance will be indefinitely postponed. Anything that calls off attention from present dangers to remote dangers will be warmly welcomed, however serious the future danger may be. A contingent national prohibition is not half so menacing to a nuisance as an urgent, well enforced district law. Many temperance men believe that while the Government has a legal right to prohibit in the District of Columbia and in the Territories, it has no moral right, and it would be a stretch of power to the very limits of tyranny, to do so while prohibition is not yet enacted by the States. If the sentiment of the Territories is not yet educated up to the point of prohibiting for themselves, it is more in accordance with the American idea to await the development of such sentiment from within, than to force prohibition upon the Territory from without. Angry and disappointed Republicans should remember that this question was ably argued during the last Presidential campaign by leading prohibitionists, and nowhere more ably argued than by a woman before the Woman's Convention at St. Louis. Leading prohibitionists, male and female, maintained against their own adherents, that the American idea of personal liberty is a more sacred trust than personal temperance, and that a man must often be left free to do wrong rather than forced to do right. This can be made an issue in temperance action as well as in temperance discussion; but as such, it will divide and weaken the advocates of temperance

and will give a longer lease of life to measures that permit and promote intemperance.

The intemperance of some temperance people is causing the sober element of the Temperance Party to scrutinize most closely the paths before us, to see whether some that have seemed new and narrow, be not, really, disguised but direct avenues into the old, broad, familiar ways that lead to destruction. There are many temperate citizens who believe that while we are waiting "in the use of means" for all men to be educated to self-restraint, which is temperance, and for public sentiment to widen sufficiently to enact and to enforce that prohibition which individual men may not be strong enough to enforce upon themselves, society has the right, and necessarily therefore is under obligation, to protect its members by enacting and enforcing such laws as it can command; and that it should restrain, by the severest effective taxation, a trade which it cannot yet wholly abolish. Among these men are the most successful practical philanthropists of the day; yet against them, professional temperance men use language as intemperate as any that ever emanated from the vat of the brewer or the worm of the still. The "Temperance Review," "a family newspaper," thus speaks of a proposal to tax liquor-sellers five hundred dollars a year:

"Great divines, both Catholic and Protestant, make haste to sell the right to damn men for five hundred dollars per year. . . . Men who profess to be commissioned to labor with Jesus Christ to destroy the works of the devil, deliberately continue to let the devil open his by-ways to hell for five hundred dollars a way. And for what purpose? . . . Every drunkard shall have an opportunity to get drunk and beat and maim, shoot and stamp, if for the privilege of making men insane they pay five hundred dollars cash. God says, 'Thou shalt not;' the great lights of St. Paul [Minnesota] say, 'Thou shalt' for five hundred dollars a year."

It is to be hoped that the editor of this family newspaper wrote in the imbecility of intoxication. It is far more appalling that a sober mind should have produced these words with malice aforethought, than that a drunken mind should have hiccoughed them out half unconsciously. Inebriety would mean nothing but inebriety; sobriety would mean a habit of heedless and harmful speaking, a steady bent to total depravity. The leader of this class, the Presidential candidate of the Prohibition Party, evinced in his public speeches the same fatal inability to see facts, to comprehend

the meaning and the use of words. He averred that the Republican Party desires to make "the liquor traffic permanent in this country, to the end that the States and Territories may derive a revenue therefrom." Only a brain sodden with liquor or dull from some congenital defect could honestly make a statement that presents this total abstinence from truth. He showed an equal inability to cope with the English language when he declared that no man can run a saloon without a permit from the United States. He might just as well say that no man can smuggle whisky without a permit from the United States. The Government lays a tax on the saloons, imposes a fine upon smugglers. It might burn the saloons, it might hang the smugglers, if the popular sentiment could be embodied in legislation to that effect. If it did, it would not be a "permit" to the saloons and the smugglers, but it would be just as much a permit as it is under the present tax, only the conditions of the permit would be a little harder. Yet persons who profess to be working for humanity resist the attempt to restrain the liquor-traffic as strenuously as if it were an attempt to extend it. Misled by the word license, which is a term of restriction, they combat license as if it meant non-restriction. The Supreme Court of Michigan has lately rendered a decision declaring that "the imposition of a tax . . . is not a license but a restraint." This is no matter of opinion merely; it is a matter of experiment and of evidence. The family newspaper accuses great divines of hastening to sell the right to damn men for five hundred dollars a year. One of these great divines is the Rev. Howard Crosby, D.D., of New York. Dr. Crosby is a man whose opinion will not be sneered at even by prohibitionists. He publicly advised votes for St. John. Religious newspapers in New York testify that his organization for the prevention of crime has been the most effective in the city. Constantly impeded by the low state of public sentiment in the community and among the public officials, his society shut up 1,790 places in the first year of its existence. Four years ago every liquor saloon had its front door open on Sunday; now it is closed and barred. Dr. Crosby is said to be the best hated man by the liquor-dealers in the city of New York. Such a man cannot be set aside as a brewer, a rum-apologist, a friend of publicans and sinners, and Dr. Crosby says that he considers the "prohibition doctrine both a blunder and a farce." He voted for Mr. St. John, because "he cannot legislate, if elected

President. He can only execute. The prohibition sentiments of St. John are, therefore, no hinderance to my voting for him."

It is a little extraordinary to see the reverend gentleman so publicly and needlessly giving himself a slap in the face, on the plea that it will not hurt; but the only point that concerns us is, that this eminent practical temperance worker counts prohibition, even with a small *p*, a blunder and a farce. The political prohibitionist takes the ground that all the by-ways to hell are open unless they are closed by his patent lock. The great divine points to the 1,790 shops actually shut, but the prohibitionist refuses to see them, because they are shut by high license and not by prohibition. The devil, of whom the prohibitionist speaks so familiarly and confidently, undoubtedly lends a hand, but it is as the father of lies, not as the father of liquor.

The same high authority that I have cited in the decision of the Michigan Supreme Court declares that "prohibition has been tried in this State. Failing, however, to accomplish the result desired, the people have resorted to the more usual means of regulation and taxation." The result is matter of fact, not of opinion. In one place where there were twenty-five saloons under prohibition, there were but nine under tax. In Detroit over 500 were closed out by tax law. In Ann Arbor, under prohibition in 1872, there were seventy saloons and breweries; there are now only thirty-two, and only sixty-four in the whole county. Magistrates and sheriffs tell us "there is not half the disorder there was under prohibition." Dr. Dio Lewis, who will not be considered an advocate of intemperance, says:

"I have recently been out to the Rocky Mountains, and on my way East I got off the train at several of the large cities, and among other things made inquiry into the practical benefits the public had received from the enactment of prohibition laws. In places where I had been told an intoxicating drink could not be obtained for love or money at any store, I saw men reeling on the streets in an almost helpless state of drunkenness. In Iowa City, where prohibition is supposed to be enforced, I saw from seventy-five to one hundred kegs of beer delivered on trucks from a brewery. I asked a resident of this place, 'How is it that such an open violation of the law and such a bold defiance of public sentiment is permitted?' 'Well,' said he, 'the brewer has given us to understand that any one who interfered with his private affairs took his life in his hand, and no one has yet appeared who has had sufficient courage to enforce the Law. This brewer means what he says, and I don't know any one among us willing to become a martyr to the cause of prohibition.' For many reasons I believe in temperance, but am of the opinion that prohibition

is simply a wild theory ; that in practice it has not met the claims of its supporters, and as an aid to the cause of temperance it is a failure."

In Minnesota, under high license—in the very State in which our family newspaper was dedicating its great divines to the devil's work—the five hundred and forty-seven saloons of a single city were in one year reduced to two hundred and seventy-four. The increase of the tax from one hundred to five hundred dollars, not only nearly trebled their payment to the city's treasury, but swept away nearly half the saloons. The police department testify that the effective policing of the city has become much easier in consequence ; that the saloons closed were generally of the worst character ; that there has been a discernible decrease of drunkenness, a large falling off in misdemeanors attributable to drunkenness, and a marked improvement in the good order of the city. Our family newspaper calls this "the high license craze let loose." There certainly is a craze, but it is not on the part of the great divines who advocated a course that has closed half the saloons of Minneapolis.

In Illinois a similar result has been reached. The saloons of Chicago were suddenly forced into paying a \$500 tax. Under the old system they yielded to the city a revenue of \$400,000. With the new license they yielded a revenue of \$1,500,000. In nineteen other cities 733 liquor-shops yielded a public revenue of \$89,950. With high license, the shops decreased to 468, but yielded a public revenue of \$253,000.

Was any wrong done in forcing the saloons to contribute this sum toward mitigating the poverty and defraying the expense that temperance sentiment was not strong enough to prevent? More than this money, wrung from them to replenish the coffers which their trade tends constantly to exhaust, infinitely more significant than any money, is the testimony that throughout the State the total number of saloons was diminished by from three to four thousand. All these by-ways to hell were closed, and not one was opened. Arrests fell off, and there was 30 per cent. less of drunkenness, yet the "Temperance Review" accuses the clergy whose action helped on this beneficent result of deliberately contriving to let the devil open these ways to hell for five hundred dollars a way. This is the very dead-drunkenness of slander.

In Maine, the original prohibition State, a close and careful inspection, by a temperance man, so late as March 30 of the pres-

ent year, indicates that it is time for our great divines and for all who love their country and desire the improvement of humanity, to re-examine the foundation of their faith. For fifty years, says this report, Maine has been a temperance State. The Washingtonian movement originated a great number of total-abstinence societies. Licenses had been granted with discretion, and selling without license had been heavily punished. Finally the Legislature, under the influence of the growing temperance sentiment, forbade the granting of licenses, and liquor was practically driven out of half the townships of Maine and into dark corners of the other half. Open temptation ceased to exist. In 1851 the Maine law was passed, which, for medicinal and mechanical purposes, established State agencies and local agencies in every town, thus forcing rum and whisky into many towns from which they had long been banished. The actual result is, that liquor is sold to all who wish to obtain it, in nearly every town in the State. Enforcement of the law seems to have little effect. For the past six years the city of Bangor has practically enjoyed free rum. In more than one hundred places liquor is sold, and no attempt has been made to enforce the law. In Bath, Lewiston, Augusta, and other cities, no real difficulty is experienced in procuring liquor. In Portland enforcement of the law has been faithfully attempted, yet the liquor traffic flourishes for all classes, from the highest to the lowest. The prohibitionists pursued a rumseller for five years. They made him pay fines more than forty times, and finally got him into jail; and then his brother carried on the business at the old stand, and when, after a protracted siege, he was forced to retire, his brother-in-law took his place, and keeps it to this day. In a journey last summer for hundreds of miles through the cities and through the scattered villages and hamlets of Maine, the almost universal testimony was, "You can get liquor enough for bad purposes in bad places, but you cannot get it for good purposes in good places."

This is not decisive against prohibition. Much is accomplished when the tempter cannot sit at the corners of the streets, openly tempting the weak, but is forced to hide in the dark. What makes against prohibition is, that in the opinion of many of the most earnest total-abstinence men, the original Maine Law State, after thirty years of prohibition, is no more a temperance State now than it was before prohibition was introduced. In Kansas, where

the most stringent prohibition has been enacted and has had the inestimable advantage of Gov. St. John's fostering care, Dr. Cardner testifies that the drug-stores are little more than rum-shops, and that their number is astonishing. In Pittsburg, a thrifty little town of 4,000 people, he counted fifteen drug-stores and twenty doctors' signs on the main street. They scarcely pretend to keep medicines, save of the simplest kind, "but they sell any quantity of liquor. . . . I found this to be the principal business of the doctors and druggists in all the parts of Kansas I visited, and from my inquiries of others I am convinced that it is the case throughout the State." Neither the reason of wise and honest prohibitionists, nor the rant of wild and dishonest ones, can alter the nature of these facts or disprove their grave significance. In the face of such facts, the claim of any class of men to a special Divine revelation on this subject cannot be successfully established. When the temperance reviewer quotes the Ruler of the Universe as saying "Thou shalt not," he is forced to leave his quotation swinging in the air. "Thou shalt not"—what? Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn, says the Bible. Three gallons of whisky are made from a bushel of corn, and the distiller may affirm that God says, "Thou shalt not forbid the manufacture of whisky." This would be a thoroughly unwarrantable interpretation, but no more unwarrantable than any interpretation of any Scripture into "Thou shalt not lay a tax of five hundred dollars on the sale of whisky." God—the God of the Bible, the God of conscience, the God of human society—says, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." When the prohibitionist charges the great divines who are closing the doors of temptation with deliberately contriving to let the devil open them, he is violating the Divine Law formulated in the Bible, incorporated in the human heart, inwrought into the body politic.

Great divines in other parts of the world take the same view of the temperance action that is condemned as devilish in the great divines of Minnesota. Dr. A. W. Thorold, Bishop of Rochester, England, for the past three years has spent his annual holiday in helping to lay the foundation of the [Episcopal] Church Temperance Society. From Maine to Oregon, he bears witness to "the genuine and profound enthusiasm felt by the country in the cause of temperance." He has addressed public temperance meetings at Buffalo, St. Louis, Kansas City, Denver, Salt Lake City, Detroit,

St. Paul, Minneapolis, Faribault, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, New York, and the University of Virginia. Necessarily without partisanship, without claim to any five hundred dollars to be secured by damning men, and therefore with no temptation to aid in this fiends' work, what is the testimony of this divine? He says :

“The subject is uppermost in our thoughts because every one has sympathy with it. It is complicated because each man has his own nostrum and dislikes his neighbor's. It is prejudiced in the eyes of moderate men by intolerance and exaggeration, and it is not made purer by being mingled with politics. The duty of the friends of temperance is plain. They must combine their forces on one solid basis of total abstainers and of those who use intoxicants temperately. Instead of pressing for more legislation, they must first put in force what they have. Restriction is more practicable than prohibition, and restriction is best effected by the raising of the price of licenses. . . . If we in England could only get the legislation you have got in the most of your States for prohibiting the sale of liquors on Sunday and to minors and to persons who have had sufficient already, we should have enough legislation to last us fifty years.”

It may be questioned whether we have legislation enough to last fifty years, but we have enough for the present. Legislation is already far in advance of public sentiment; too far, as we have seen, for it to feel the spur of public sentiment. Of a little town in Massachusetts, the citizens, in town-meeting assembled, voted for prohibition and against license, by a vote of 83 to 1; and they appropriated five hundred dollars to enforce the law. In that village were opened, during the ensuing year, three houses where liquor was sold; where any one could, and many did, freely buy, without attempt at let or hinderance, or prosecution. What could more law do for them? Public sentiment was strong enough to enact law, but not strong enough to enforce it when enacted; strong enough to forbid selling, but not strong enough to prevent drinking.

It is appalling to see well-meaning persons turn away from present work which, though difficult, is not impossible, to future work whose impossibility is not less because not immediately demonstrable. Instead of bringing the community up to the execution of laws already enacted, by machinery already existing, we clamor for new laws, for a Constitutional amendment, for the woman's ballot. In a prohibitory State, shortly after the November election, I heard a clergyman, who had seen, apparently, in the whole campaign nothing but a Prohibitory amendment to the Con-

stitution, deliver a sermon on the prevalence of drunkenness in his own city, the crimes consequent, and the great neglect of duty in the enforcement of liquor laws! If the appetite of drunken men is too strong, if the conscience of temperate men is too weak, for the laws that inclose them at home, what is to be effected by a future law at the center of government a thousand miles away? The one enemy to be grappled with is a consuming thirst and a weak will in the individual man. Few weapons are farther off or more ineffectual than an amendment to the national Constitution. What is wanted is an amendment to the man's own constitution. Far more practical and pointed is the truth contained in the pithy philosophy, that the only way to reform a man is to reform his grandmother. We may find this hard, but less hard than to reform a man by act of Congress or by a three-fourths vote of the States. The grandmothers of the drunkards of the future are closer to us than a Constitutional amendment that shall prohibit and prevent the manufacture of intoxicating liquors.

Here women can lay hold on temperance with a mighty hand. The president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union claims that the enforcement ballot of the nation must be woman's because—because women as a class are free from the appetite for drink! This is foreordained failure. Not one step is ever made by resisting somebody's else temptation. Man's appetite, pitted against woman's muscle, will always win. What women cannot accomplish by moral power they cannot accomplish by physical power, because men are stronger than women. A ballot is not might, any more than a bank-note is money. The bank-note, by common agreement, passes for money and is a convenient device. The ballot, by the common consent of the highest civilization, stands for physical power, and is even more convenient. It would be very clumsy to fight out every election, but voting it out would be of no use except to show that it could be fought out if necessary. A low civilization in the Democratic Party in 1860 refused to let the ballot stand for physical power, but found after four years of fighting that physical power was what the ballot meant. A very low form of civilization in the Democratic Party in Albany, in November, 1884, threatened to make another trial of the same kind, which would have had the same result, with even more emphasis. Women make a great mistake in assuming that a ballot is but a piece of paper, which a woman can drop into a box

just as easily as a man. A ballot means a bullet, and a bayonet, forced marches, digging trenches, sleeping on the ground, carrying a knapsack. Physical force, whenever needed, must be administered by men. The physical power of woman is not even a factor in the political problem. In our civilization she never has been, and she never will be, called upon to lift her hand in the enforcement of law, any more than if she did not possess a hand. No access of woman voters would bring any access of material strength to the nation. No access of woman prohibitionists will lend any material strength to the enforcement of the law. Whatever women cannot do by moral power, by spiritual energy, they cannot do at all. As long as men will to drink, drink they will. Women do effective temperance work just so far as they free men from the appetite for drink, and no farther. Prohibition is valuable just so far as it helps to free men from the appetite for drink, and not one step farther. The only preventive of drunkenness is character. The only remedy for drunkenness is character—and possibly, they now say, cocaine! The formation and development of character is woman's business. The cure of souls is her mission work. The child that is built up strongly within, increasing in wisdom as he increases in stature, disciplined, self-controlled, under the reign of law, will never be a drunkard. Thus to build up the human being is no easy work; but it is an easier work than, after he has shambled or thrust his way up into a violent, indolent, self-indulgent, weak-willed adult, to keep him from continually lapsing into degradation. Whatever can be done to shield this unhappy creature from temptation, without trenching upon the personal liberty of the unfallen, it is the eager desire of all temperate persons to do; but when that is done the hardest work remains—to build up the man himself, to supplement the defects of his training, to substitute healthy for diseased tissue, to change weakness into strength. This is hard; but if it is impossible, then all temperance work is futile. Societies, pledges, platforms, legislation, are worth only their effect on the drunkard's tissues, on the drunkard's will. Audiences gathered, newspapers circulated, towns visited, are no test whatever of work done. Men rescued from low habits, children reared to high tastes, an orderly and elevated social life—by that sign alone we conquer.

The one hope of an unrestricted liquor traffic is in the Democratic Party, and the one hope of the Democratic Party is in the

Prohibition Party. Before temperance as a public sentiment, as a moral principle, as a manly habit, the saloons must go down. As a political plank, as an election contest, as a Constitutional amendment, temperance is a mere diversion from the main issue, is not feared, is indeed desired, by the Democratic Party. There is not a State in which they do not hail it as a relief from impending, immediate danger. Intemperance apprehends no harm to its craft from the Prohibition Party, while absolutism is always endangered by the triumph of the Republican Party. The Democratic Party, with its principles outspoken and its record read of all men, has no chance before the people. In the South, where the Democratic Party has entrenched itself by force, political prohibition is not suffered to move the wing or open the mouth or peep. In Georgia three-fourths of the counties enforce prohibition; in Georgia, of a total vote of 143,610, the prohibition candidate received 195. But in the North, where the Democratic Party is weak, it cherishes prohibition like a nursing mother, and its caresses are returned with a collusive fondness. Straight as if winged from a Democratic bow, the prohibition arrow flew to the States where the Democratic Party had the best show for victory. Torpid in all the States where it could harm the Democratic Party and where it could not vitally harm the Republican Party, it was active in those States where even its small power could turn the tide against Republicans. What has been done may be done again, but it will be better understood. Prohibitionists may continue to be Democratic allies, but they will not be so well disguised Democrats. "God and home and native land" will always have a suspicious tang, and even woman's instinct will need to show its credentials when it appears on the stump bearing the St. John sort of "home" in a charger.

The logic of the universe is not disturbed by our refusal to recognize it. It amused Madame de Pompadour to play at political genius, to sit in councils, to dismiss and appoint generals, to direct battles, to act as if she were a great man instead of a lost woman; but the eternal procession of cause and effect was not for one moment delayed by her pretty airs, or deflected by her self-deception. Rather was she, unconscious, swept into the somber funeral march. None the less for her, all the more for her, came confusion and dismay to France. The royal dynasty went down to rise no more, and not the least of its fate-compelling and immortal infamies was

a puny hand clutching for one brief hour the scepter of control. More allied to those virtuous women who are piously paving the drunkard's hell with their good intentions, was the unhappy Isabella, who in thorough love and loyalty bent the neck of Spain to the yoke of the Inquisition. Religious devotion, conscientious conviction, single-hearted patriotism, availed nothing against the eternal law of the universe into which she was born. Just as fatally as if she had been its mortal foe, she fastened upon her beloved realm a burden too heavy to be borne, under which it sank into a stupor of centuries, from which it has never yet arisen.

GAIL HAMILTON.